
Vol. XII No. 4

Summer 1990

Creation Social Science and Humanities QUARTERLY



CREATION SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES SOCIETY

The Creation Social Science and Humanities Society (CSSHS) was incorporated in Wichita, Kansas, in 1977. The CSSHS is educational, and will promote and disseminate information on the implications of the Biblical creation model of origins for the social sciences and humanities, with emphasis on the development of these disciplines in accordance with the rapidly emerging and increasingly well established natural scientific models of Biblical creation.

The **Quarterly Journal** is directed toward teachers and students of the social sciences and humanities, especially in institutions of higher learning. The CSSHS may also publish books, monographs, and other writings, and sponsor speakers, seminars, and research projects related to its educational purpose.

IRS tax-exempt status was granted December 30, 1977. All contributions are tax-deductible.

Voting membership is initially by invitation of the Board of Directors of CSSHS to candidates eligible on the following basis.

a. persons with at least a baccalaureate degree in the social sciences or humanities; or

b. persons 18 years old or over, who have held office in another creation-science organization with beliefs, substantially identical with those contained in the CSSHS **Statement of Belief**, for at least one year immediately prior to applying for membership in the CSSHS; or who have a commitment to our belief and work clearly evidenced by their record of actual involvement. Voting membership dues are \$12 (foreign, \$13 U.S.) per year.

Sustaining membership is open to those who subscribe to the C.S.S.H.S. **Statement of Belief**. Sustaining membership dues are \$12 (foreign, \$13 U.S.) per year.

Both voting and sustaining memberships include subscription to the **CSSH Quarterly**, and are reckoned as beginning and ending in September.

Non-members may subscribe to the **CSSH Quarterly** at the rate of \$14 (foreign, \$15 U.S.) per year.

Officers: Dr. Paul D. Ackerman, *President*; Mrs. Diane Powell, *Vice-President*; Mrs. Ellen Myers, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

Editor: Dr. Paul D. Ackerman.

Board of Reference: Dr. Duane T. Gish, *San Diego, California*; Rev. Walter Lang, *Minneapolis Minnesota*; Dr. Henry M. Morris, *San Diego, California*; Dr. Harold S. Slusher, *El Paso, Texas*; Dr. John C. Whitcomb, Jr., *Winona Lake, Indiana*; Dr. Clifford A. Wilson, *Mt. Waverly, Victoria, Australia*.

DEVOTIONAL

Creation and Worship

Ellen Myers

Christians in the battle for creation against evolution since the 1960s have been mostly concerned with scientific evidences and with the impact of beliefs about origins for human action. However, when the Lord Who made heaven and earth and all things chooses us as His witnesses, His first purpose for us is that we might look upon Him: "You are My witnesses, says the LORD, and My servants whom I have chosen, That you may know and believe Me, and understand that I am He" (Isaiah 43:10). Only then He reveals Himself as the only true God: "Before Me there was no God formed, nor shall there be after Me" (ibid.). We must give our Creator His due first place as we speak of His creation.

Creation points first of all to God's transcendence, to his "eternal power and Godhead" (Romans 1:20). Over and over again He identifies Himself in Scripture as the God Who has made all things and is therefore incomparably higher, mightier and more awesome than the false gods of men's own fancy. Doubtless unbelievers are so furious in their war against creation because they understand that creation above all points to God's absolute majesty.

The God of creation is "the high and lofty one that inhabits eternity, whose name is Holy" (Isaiah 57:15). His name Jehovah means "I am," or "The Eternal One" (Exodus 3:14). He says: "I am God, and there is none else; I am God and there is none like me, declaring the end from the beginning" (Is. 46:9-10). He alone can tell us "the former things of old," the way the world began, because He is the Creator of all that exists: "Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God" (Psalm 90:2). "Thou, even thou, art Lord alone; thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth, and all things that are therein, the seas and all that is therein" (Nehemiah 9:6). "For, lo, he that formeth the mountains, and createth the wind, and declareth unto man what is his thought, that maketh the morning darkness, and treadeth upon the high places of the earth, the Lord, the God of Hosts, is his name" (Amos 4:13). The prophet Jonah testified to the sailors caught in the storm of his God as the Creator: "I am a Hebrew; and I fear the LORD, the God of heaven, who made the sea and the dry land" (Jonah 1:9). Our Lord is worthy of praise first of all as Creator: "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created" (Revelation 4:11). The "everlasting gospel" preached at the end of this age proclaims God as Creator: "The angel ... swore by Him who lives forever and ever, who created heaven and the things that are in it, the earth and the

things that are in it, and the sea and the things that are in it, that there should be delay no longer" (Revelation 10:5-6). "Then I saw another angel, flying in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach to those who dwell on the earth - to every nation, tribe, tongue, and people - saying with a loud voice, 'Fear God and give glory to Him, for the hour of His judgment has come, and worship Him who made heaven and earth, the sea and springs of water'" (Rev. 14:6-7).

In the heat of our battle about origins we may have neglected the indispensable reverence due our Lord and Creator Himself. Yet this reverence alone puts our relationship to God and hence to each other and the rest of creation in proper perspective. We need to "be still and know that He is God" (Psalm 46:10). When proclaiming the wonders of His handiwork we must not do so only as a weapon of debate but while revering Him in His holy fear, for "the secret of the LORD is with them that fear Him" (Ps. 25:14, Prov. 9:10, etc.). We must recover our awe of Him who is incomprehensibly other than and higher than we. "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, says the LORD. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts" (Is. 54:8-9). "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!" (Romans 11:33). As we preach renewal to our generation by the message of biblical creation we must show forth the majesty and holiness of our Creator.

Former generations of believers, whatever their faults, did not lack awe and fear of the Creator. When Martin Luther as a young Catholic priest said Mass for the first time, he came to these words: "We offer unto thee, the living, the eternal God."

He said afterwards that "At these words I was utterly stupefied and terror-stricken. I thought to myself, 'With what tongue shall I address such Majesty, seeing that all men ought to tremble in the presence of even an earthly Prince? Who am I, that I should lift up mine eyes or raise my hands to the divine Majesty? ... For I am dust and ashes and full of sin and I am speaking to the living, eternal and the true God.'"

In our own century A. W. Tozer grieved about the loss of this indispensable awe of our sovereign, eternal Lord and King among Christians. In his wonderful book *The Knowledge of the Holy* he deals exhaustively with God's majesty and transcendence, holiness and sovereignty. He reminds us of "the wall, infinitely high, that separates That-which-is-God from that-which-is-not-God. To think of creature and Creator as alike in essential being is to rob God of most of His attributes and reduce Him to the status of a creature." As we labor to restore the doctrine of biblical creation to its rightful foundational place in all Christian teaching, may our Lord give us grace to overcome the subtle temptation of forgetting Him, Himself, in what we do. May we, together with His creation, always witness to "His eternal power and Godhead" (Rom. 1:20). Amen.

CREATION AND PROOF FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

Ellen Myers

According to the Bible, unbelievers suppress the truth in unrighteousness, because what may be known of God is manifest in them, for God has shown it to them. For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse, because, although they knew God, they did not glorify Him as God, nor were thankful, but became futile in their thoughts ... and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator ... (Romans 1:18-21,25)

We see from this Scripture that (1) men deny God and His very existence not ignorantly or innocently but "in unrighteousness" and "without excuse," because God gave men evident knowledge of Himself clearly seen by the creation ("the things that are made"); and (2) men denying God "became futile in their thinking."

Especially the last point, the futility of the thought of men who deny God, is a recurring teaching of Scripture. It appears already before the Fall, when Satan, the arch liar and father of lies as Jesus Christ Himself calls him (John 8:44), suggested to Eve that by eating of the forbidden tree she could be like God, knowing good and evil (Gen.3:5). The Fall, therefore, involved our first parents' decision to act upon their own reason apart from and against God. The moment man begins to reason from himself rather than God the Creator and Lord as his starting point, his thoughts are futile. To reason from ourselves autonomously is the root temptation and pitfall we must all shun, especially when defending the Christian faith. This is why the Apostle Peter warns us earnestly to "sanctify the Lord God in your hearts, and always be ready to give a defense to everyone who asks you a reason for the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear" (1 Peter 3:15). Proverbs 3:5-6 orders us to "Trust in the LORD with all your heart, and lean not on your own understanding; In all your ways acknowledge Him, and He shall make straight (or smooth) your paths." Psalm 94:11 says, "The LORD knows the thoughts of man, that they are futile." 1 Corinthians 3:19-20 says (Amplified New Testament): "For this world's wisdom is foolishness--absurdity and stupidity--with God. For it is written, He lays hold of the wise in their (own) craftiness; And again, The Lord knows the thoughts and reasonings of the (humanly) wise and recognizes how futile they are." The Apostle Paul reminds the Corinthian converts to Christ that he did not proclaim God to them "in lofty words of eloquence or human philosophy and wisdom," but rather "in demonstration of the (Holy) Spirit and power, so that your faith might not rest in the wisdom of men (human philosophy), but in

the power of God" (1 Cor.2:1, 4-5). Consider also Isaiah 55:7-9; Jeremiah 9:23-24; Luke 10:21, where our Lord Jesus Christ praises His Father, the Lord of heaven and earth, because He had "hidden these things from the wise and prudent and revealed them to babes." 2 Cor.10:5 exhorts us to "bring every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ." Ephesians 4:17 speaks of the Gentiles' (unbelievers') "futility of thinking (mind)." Colossians 2:8 warns against "philosophy and empty deceit." Proverbs 1:7 says that "the fear of the LORD" (not the exercise of human autonomous reason) is "the beginning of knowledge." Isaiah 8:20 proclaims: "To the law and to the testimony! If they do not speak according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Many other Scriptures address this fundamental issue.

Let us keep these clear and plentiful biblical warnings against reasoning from anything less than God Himself firmly in mind as we consider a few philosophical proofs for the existence of God. Creation, the sure pointer to God according to Romans 1:20, is not often explicitly part of such proofs, while presuppositions from non-Christian world views are. Therefore such philosophical proofs suffer in various degrees from four common defects: (a) they do not agree with the Bible that because of creation God's existence is in fact self-evident, and that unbelievers suppress this truth willfully in unrighteousness; (b) they may be imbued with the non-Christian world views from which they think they can borrow without penalty; (c) they only "prove" their particular philosophical definitions of God rather than the God of Christianity; and (d) in disregard of Scriptures such as the ones listed above, they tend to elevate human reason to a place of equality with God's revelation. Francis Schaeffer believes that this last trend began in the thirteenth century A.D., when "the great Aquinas (1225-1274) had already begun, in deference to Aristotle (384-322 B.C.), to open the door to placing revelation and human reason on an equal footing."¹

St. Augustine (354-430 A.D.), probably Western Christendom's greatest seminal thinker, developed "proofs" for the existence of God as commentaries upon Scripture. Biblical creation out of nothing was their chief pillar, together with the soul's search for God. In accordance with Romans 1:18-25 Augustine took for granted that only "with the exception of a few in whom nature is excessively depraved, the whole human race confesses God to be the author of the world" and that even a man admitting of many gods "still attempts to conceive 'the one God of gods' as 'something than which nothing more excellent or sublime exists.'" St. Augustine wrote that

the order and unity of Nature proclaims the unity of the Creator, just as the goodness of creatures, their positive reality, reveals the goodness of God and the order and stability of the universe manifest the wisdom of God. On the other hand, God, as the self-existent, eternal and immutable Being, is infinite, and, as infinite, incomprehensible. God is His own Perfection, is 'simple', so that His wisdom and knowledge, His goodness and power, are His own essence, which is without accidents. God,

therefore, transcends space in virtue of His spirituality and infinity and simplicity, as He transcends time in virtue of His eternity...²

Thus St. Augustine safeguarded the transcendence of God as Creator. He lovingly spoke of the God he knew, person to Person rather than about God as a philosophical concept, being "not so much concerned to prove to the atheist that God exists as to show how all creation proclaims the God whom the soul can experience in itself, the living God. It was the dynamic attitude of the soul towards God which interested him, not the construction of dialectical arguments with a purely theoretical conclusion."³

As the Christian faith began to be confronted with questioning, rationalistic university scholars such as Peter Abelard (1079-1142) and with "the inquisitive, questing spirit of Muslim scholarship,"⁴ more and more rationalistic philosophical arguments with starting points other than the God of Scripture Himself developed among defenders of the faith. Consider the famous ontological argument of St. Anselm (1033-1109), formulated as an address to God. St. Anselm introduced it with a cry from the heart: "I long to understand the truth, which my heart believes and loves. For I do not seek to understand that I may believe, but I believe in order to understand. For this also I believe--that unless I believed, I should not understand."⁵ The essential parts of the ontological argument are these:

... we believe that thou art a being than which nothing greater can be conceived ... And assuredly that, than which nothing greater can be conceived, cannot exist in the understanding alone. For, suppose it exists in the understanding alone; then it can be conceived to exist in reality; which is greater. ... Hence, there is no doubt that there exists a being than which nothing greater can be conceived, and it exists both in the understanding and in reality ...

And it assuredly exists so truly, that it cannot be conceived not to exist. For, it is possible to conceive of a being which cannot be conceived not to exist, and this is greater than one which can be conceived not to exist. ... There is, then, so truly a being than which nothing greater can be conceived to exist, that it cannot even be conceived not to exist; and this being thou art, O Lord, our God.

St. Anselm included biblical creation and its difference between God the Creator and man the creature as a sort of postscript:

So truly, therefore, dost thou exist, O Lord, my God, that thou canst not be conceived not to exist; and rightly. For, if a mind could conceive of a being greater than thee, the creature would rise above the Creator; and this is most absurd. And, indeed, whatever else there is, except thee alone, can be conceived not to exist.⁶

The monk Gaunilo, a contemporary of St. Anselm, attacked this argument on the plausible grounds that our idea of a thing does not guarantee that the thing actually exists. Frederick Copleston sums up St. Anselm's reply:

...if the idea of God is the idea of an all-perfect Being and if

absolute perfection involves existence, this idea is the idea of an existent, and necessarily existent Being ... If God is possible, i.e. if the idea of the all-perfect and necessary Being contains no contradiction, God must exist, since it would be absurd to speak of a merely possible necessary Being (it is a contradiction in terms) ...⁷

The ontological argument is an impressive construct of sheer reason and logic. However, it is subject to denial as we have seen; Immanuel Kant rejected it altogether as a tautology. More importantly, despite St. Anselm's sincere faith and good intentions the "being than which nothing greater can be conceived" need not be the God of the Bible. It might be the cosmic "Force" of the neopagan New Age movement today! A philosophical argument can only "prove" the philosophical concept it sets out to prove, and that only tentatively. We must therefore take our stand with Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153), "the most dynamic figure of the twelfth century, if not the whole of the Middle Ages,"⁸ who opposed Peter Abelard on the grounds that not disputation but faith is the mark of the righteous Christian believer. Likewise the great French scientist and Christian Blaise Pascal (1623-1662) exultantly rejected the "God of philosophers and learned men" who could never give him the "certitude certitude feeling joy peace" he received upon meeting the "God of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob ... and Jesus Christ" person to Person in the night of November 23, 1654.⁹

St. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1276) rejected the ontological argument. He did so while denying that the existence of God is self-evident on the grounds that some men deny God's existence. This is contrary to Romans 1:18; unbelieving man's reason is not "neutral" but actively engaged in "suppressing the truth in unrighteousness." Instead of the ontological argument Aquinas offered his celebrated five proofs for the existence of God. They argue (1) from motion to God as first mover, (2) from the nature of an efficient cause to God as first efficient or ultimate cause, (3) from possibility and necessity to God as being His own necessity and causing the necessity of others, (4) from the gradation of things from lower to higher to God as the highest and most perfect, and (5) teleologically for God as the Giver of the end and purpose of all things.

Let us briefly evaluate these proofs. Proof (1) leads to a "first mover," but this being need not be the God of Christianity. Aristotle, whom Aquinas greatly admired and sought to incorporate in Christian philosophy pursuant to Pope Urban IV's request of 1263, also spoke of "God" as "first mover." His "first mover," however, was part and parcel of the cosmos which it "moved" by attraction. Aristotle's "god" was certainly not the Creator of the Bible, as for him the world had existed from all eternity.

The "efficient cause" of Proof (2) may be, for example, whatever it was that "caused" the original One of pantheism to break up or send forth emanations. An "efficient cause" need not be the personal, transcendent God of Scripture Who is original Creator of all things out of nothing, as the Bible clearly teaches. Proof (3) is, as Aquinas himself says, closely related to Proof (2) and therefore subject to this same

possibility of misinterpretation.

Proof (4) makes "God" the highest degree of perfection of things and qualities. This line of reasoning overlooks the ontological otherness of the God of Scripture from the world of which He is the Creator out of nothing. Aquinas took the argument from gradation from Aristotle as well. However, Aristotle's world view, as that of all pagan thought, was based upon monism, the presupposition that all is ultimately one, with no room for the transcendent, personal God and Creator of the Bible Who is "other-than," outside and above the world.

Proof (5) for God as the Giver of the end and purpose of all things infers and anticipates the argument from design in nature for God as the supreme "Watchmaker" made by William Paley over five hundred years later (Paley's *Evidences* was first published in 1802), though Paley reasoned independent of Aquinas. It upholds the transcendence of God because it implicitly recognizes Him as the Creator of all things for His own pleasure (Revelation 4:11). It reasons from intelligence as the directing principle (not highest degree of perfection) of all natural things. It uses the example of an archer shooting an arrow to its mark, an illustration pointing to the personhood of God. Yet it concludes, as it logically must, by identifying God merely with its philosophical concept of "some intelligent being" directing all natural things to their end. This "intelligent being," however, may logically be Hegel's and Teilhard de Chardin's "God" as the monistic "world spirit" realizing itself in nature and history rather than the absolutely transcendent God of the Bible.

Both the ontological argument and Aquinas' five proofs continued to intrigue later, increasingly rationalistic philosophers, though they did not belong to the scholastic tradition. Rene Descartes (1596-1650), whose philosophical starting point was his own thought ('I think, therefore I am') accepted the ontological proof and also argued for the existence of God on the basis that he himself must necessarily have been created by God, and that the idea of God he found within himself was a result of the Image of God in which he was created. The German philosopher Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646-1716) accepted the ontological proof but thought it was imperfect because the possibility of a supremely perfect being must be proven without contradiction. Once this possibility has been demonstrated, however, "it could be said that the existence of God was demonstrated geometrically a priori."¹⁰ Leibniz also believed that other means to prove the existence of God had validity, especially his "argument from the contingency of the world," which essentially incorporates Aquinas' Proofs (2) and (3) for God as the efficient and necessary ultimate cause of the whole world:

... for Leibniz all truths of fact or existential propositions save one (namely, the proposition 'God exists') are contingent, that is, not metaphysically necessary. The ultimate origin of 'the chain of states or series of things, the aggregate of which constitutes the world', must therefore be sought outside the series: we must pass 'from physical or hypothetical necessity, which determines the posterior states of the world by the prior, to something which is

absolute or metaphysical necessity ...¹¹

In our own generation Stanley L. Jaki, a philosopher and historian of science, has reasserted the argument from contingency for the existence of God specifically on the grounds of the science of mechanics. This science demands the ascertaining of laws within given boundary conditions; moreover, no set of individual boundary conditions can be done in its own terms, but only in the terms of a more general set. Since the entire universe has an overall boundary condition, "it is legitimate to look for its givenness in a factor which, since the universe embodies all that is physical, can only be metaphysical with respect to the whole universe. That factor is not a super-designer or an engineer-in-chief, ... but a Creator who alone is capable of producing a universe with that true mark of givenness, a contingency implying creation."¹²

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), as noted above, rejected the ontological proof as a tautology, and Leibniz's argument from the contingency of the world because all sense experience must be excluded when trying to prove the existence of a metaphysical being. Thus he would doubtless have excluded Jaki's variation of this argument from the science of mechanics as well. He thought an argument from the order in nature could at best prove an "architect" working on already existing material rather than a Creator.¹³ C.S. Lewis, "apostle to the skeptics" of our own generation, reasoned in his best-selling popular defense of the faith, *Mere Christianity*, which has won many to Christ, that a moral law of right and wrong exists among all men, which points to a personal, righteous God.

Kant notwithstanding, there is great plausibility in the arguments for God as Creator from contingency. The arguments (not formal philosophical "proofs") for the existence of God from the world's order and design used by Paley and again in the modern creation movement also speak to many. The modern creation movement of our own time has focused immense and widespread attention upon how great the world's order and complexity really is. Spokespeople for this movement have argued for creation and the God of creation on the grounds that mere matter cannot originate such metaphysical realities as space, time, moral and spiritual values, beauty, creativity, love and life itself.¹⁴ They have declined to borrow from unbiblical thought in the form of "theistic evolution" and witnessed clearly to God as Creator in conformity with Romans 1:18-25. This is why their witness is so effective despite the absence of formal "proof."

The deficiencies of philosophical "proofs" based upon autonomous human reason and with their necessarily theoretical and always uncertain conclusions have become common knowledge today. With Pascal the average person is disillusioned with "the God of philosophers and learned men." This is in agreement with what the Bible says about how God is manifest to men, and with God's promise of Isaiah 29:14 and 1 Corinthians 1:19-21: "I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent. ... Has not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For since, in the wisdom of God, the world through wisdom did not know God, it

pleased God through the foolishness of the message preached (of Christ crucified) to save those who believe." As St. Augustine wrote on the opening page of his *Confessions*, "Thou madest us for Thyself, and our heart is restless until it rests in Thee." It is really possible to rest in Him (Matthew 11:28-30). Jesus Christ testifies and Pascal confirms, together with all regenerate believers of all ages, that it is really possible to meet and know the God of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Jesus Christ revealed in the Bible person to Person (John 17:3, Galatians 2:20). It is really possible to have new life in Christ, and to be restored moment by moment to God's glorious, blessed image and likeness lost at the Fall (2 Cor. 3:18). And that is the unanswerable proof for God's existence: God's Word confirmed by reality. Nothing less will do, least of all the autonomous reasoning of unbelievers. "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them" (Isaiah 8:20).

NOTES

- 1 Francis A. Schaeffer, *How Shall We Then Live?* (Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1976; First Crossway Books paperback edition, 1983), p. 43. See also Schaeffer's discussion on pp. 52-56.
- 2 Frederick Copleston, S.J., *A History of Philosophy* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company Image Books, 1962 and later years), Vol. 2, Part I, p. 87.
3. *ibid.*, p. 84.
- 4 Bruce L. Shelley, *Church History in Plain Language* (Waco, TX: Word, 1982), p. 215.
5. George L. Abernethy and Thomas A. Langford, eds., *Philosophy of Religion: A Book of Readings* (New York: Macmillan, 1968), p. 170.
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 171-172.
7. Copleston, *A History of Philosophy*, Vol. 2, Part I, p. 185.
- 8 Bernard of Clairvaux, *The Love of God* (Portland, OR: Multnomah Press, 1983), xvi.
9. Pascal testified to this event in his marvelous "Pascal Memorial" which has been reprinted many times. Copies are available from the editor, CSSH Quarterly, 1429 N. Holyoke, Wichita, Kansas 67208.
10. Copleston, *A History of Philosophy*, Vol. 4, p. 325.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 329.
12. Stanley L. Jaki, *The Road of Science and the Ways to God* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1978), p. 292. Also see Ellen Myers, "Creation and Science: The Work of Stanley L. Jaki" in *Creation Social Science and Humanities Quarterly*, IX, 2 (Winter 1986), pp. 17-24.
13. Copleston, *A History of Philosophy*, Vol. 6, Part II, p. 93.
- 14 Cf. Henry M. Morris, ed., *Scientific Creationism* (San Diego, CA: Creation-Life Publishers, 1974), p. 20.

PROOFS FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD AND CREATION: A CATHOLIC VIEW

Paula Haigh

I. INTRODUCTION

Saint Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), Italian Dominican priest, has been honored by the Church more than any other theologian in history. Canonized in 1323, he has since been acknowledged as the Angelic Doctor, both for the purity of his life and for his incomparable writings on the angels. He has been named the Common or Universal Doctor and Patron of all Catholic schools. And yet, because the Church is catholic, that is, universal, there can and do co-exist within it many schools of thought, all faithful to the same dogmas of revealed Faith. And so, it would be untrue to say that Thomism is the only representative of Catholic theology and philosophy. However, it may and can be held that the systematic theology of Saint Thomas represents the best, the highest, and the most comprehensive Catholic theology that exists. And because of the organic nature of truth, it may be predicted that time will reveal the pre-eminence of the Thomistic synthesis over all others.

Most of the theologians of the Middle Ages held the existence of God to be self-evident. Now, self-evident facts can not be demonstrated. For example, I cannot demonstrate to anyone the fact of my own existence or the existence of that tree out there. Nor can it be demonstrated that a thing can not be and be at the same time. These facts must be accepted as given or else denied as given. But Saint Anselm and before him Saint Augustine claimed to demonstrate God's existence by reason, even though they held it to be self-evident.

How can this be? Well, it would seem that they did not recognize the existence of God as self-evident to the same degree as those other self-evident facts. Saint Thomas says that they were so accustomed to think of God that they found it to be self-evident to them even though it might not be to others. And for this reason they set out to demonstrate God's existence for those to whom it was not so self-evident. They did so, moreover, from a theology and philosophy of essence in the Platonic and neo-Platonic tradition. They did not begin with a theology and philosophy of existence as indicated by Exodus 3:14 wherein God gives His name to Moses as "I AM". It is not that Saint Augustine did not struggle with Exodus 3:14, for he did, and he complained bitterly to God for not supplying at least one predicate nominative or adjective for that verb *to be* in the present tense first person singular (see Gilson, pp.86-87). In this case, Grammar is a far better servant of theology than Platonic philosophy.

Saint Thomas, on the other hand, took Exodus 3:14 just as it is and

concluded that God's essence is His existence. In philosophical language, borrowed from Aristotle, this means that God is all actuality, for there is in Him no potency. Potency or potentiality is a principle of change and of limitation, of imperfection and need, and is found only in creatures. It is not in God. And so, by claiming for God just what Exodus 3:14 says, we can see clearly that God must exist as the source of all other existences understood as actualities.

But this is to take our cue from Holy Scripture, not from human reason alone, and it is from human reason alone that the theologians claim to prove, that is, to demonstrate the existence of God. How does Saint Thomas get around this? How does he maintain his five ways to be demonstrations from natural reason alone and not proofs taken directly from Holy Scripture and thus being truths of Faith and not of reason? Well, he does not apologize for citing Holy Scripture as his authority, nor does he cease to insist that he is demonstrating the existence of God from reason alone. It is because he uses the philosophical concepts of Aristotle that he is confident he is proceeding on the basis of reason only and not of Faith. It is only the five ways of Saint Thomas that succeed in truly demonstrating, by reason alone, that God exists and must exist to explain all other existences. The demonstrations are not facile, they are far from glib, and they are difficult. There are few men with the intellectual acumen, the perseverance, and the good will to really understand this cluster of proofs for God's existence. But Saint Thomas insists that this is, indeed, a series of proofs from reason alone that demonstrates, beyond possible refutation, the existence of God.

On the other hand, if one uses the Platonic philosophies of essence, one fails to transcend the point and sphere of the mental concept, the idea. One remains trapped within the mind. As Saint Thomas puts it, speaking of Saint Anselm's ontological argument, though without naming anyone, "Yet, granted that everyone understands that by this word 'God' is signified something than which nothing greater can be thought, nevertheless, it does not therefore follow that he understands that what the word signifies exists actually (i.e., outside the mind, in reality) but only that it exists mentally (i.e., in the mind, as a concept)." (ST, I, Q 2, ad 2)

Arguments from essence or from thought may be logically valid, but they do not on that account demonstrate the actual, extra-mental existence of God. And thus it is that Saint Thomas parts company with his famous and holy predecessors on this point of proving God's existence from reason. How, then, does he set about it himself? He holds firmly that the existence of God can be demonstrated from reason alone, but we must begin on the right epistemological foot. As Saint Paul says, we must begin with "the things that are made" (Rom.1:20), that is, with God's effects, with creatures, with the given, perceived objects of sense knowledge. These carry their own certitude and guarantee of existential fact. Unlike Plato, we must accept the objects of sensible experience as real, individual, concrete things out there, the plainly obvious realities of the world which, in turn, form a structure of things, of beings that manifest an order that is

supremely intelligible and carries its own message of the Creator's existence. If we must become as little children in order to enter into the Kingdom of God, we must also, it seems, become as little children accepting the objects of the real world as real if we are to enter the kingdom of true philosophy and theology.

2. THE FIVE WAYS OF SAINT THOMAS

The first way is by motion. It is certain that there is motion in the world because our senses tell us so. We know by observation and reason that if any thing moves, it does so by means of some agent either within itself or outside of itself. This is so because motion is defined as the passage from potency to act. Pure potency will never move into act by itself. It can not. It is like an egg which requires the active power of the sperm in order for the egg to be "activated" and the gestation process to begin. The being or aspect in potency must be moved by an agent already in act in order for the motion of change to take place. Thus, also, it is actual heat, say, that of fire, which makes wood, which is only potentially hot, to burn and become actually hot.

As for the active agent being within, here is an example. As I sit here reading or writing, I am in potency to standing, walking, running, etc. I may be moved to a change of position by a bell ringing or by an interior act of my will. In any case, my will is the interior active agent that moves me to a change of posture. So we see that whatever is moved, is moved by some agent already in act.

If we consider motion in a temporal, horizontal order, we enter what Saint Thomas calls the order of generation. The series in this order is temporal and thereby potentially or virtually infinite, that is, the series may go on as long as time goes on, and so, an "infinite regress" is possible. It is only by considering the a-temporal, vertical, and hierarchical order of creation (reality or nature) that we can arrive demonstrably and irrefutably at God's existence. For, the hierarchical order is immutable itself. It is the unchanging order of the world, of nature, of reality (unless you are an evolutionist and insist upon perverting this given evidence). We see the elements acting and interacting according to this strict law of motion which is passage from potency to act by an agent in act. Ascending to the plant kingdom, we see the same principle at work, and so on up the scale of being to man and the angels above him. Aristotle recognized the reasonableness of spiritual intelligences, and Saint Thomas, having Divine Revelation, realized that Aristotle had "discovered" the angels.

This vertical series or hierarchy of being obviously can not proceed to infinity as a series, not even to a temporal and/or virtual-potential infinitude simply because the order itself is a-temporal and therefore unchanging, metaphysical, absolute, being the very order of nature, of reality itself. Therefore, we must arrive at a Being Who is all act, the Source Himself of all other actuality, a Being Who has in Himself no potency, no change, no need for change. Furthermore, this actuality of God is absolutely necessary, for without it, without Him Who is the very source of all actuality, there would be no actuality in the world

at all and thus no motion. We conclude, therefore, that God must exist. The proof is irrefutable.

The second way is by efficient causality. We note in the things of the world and of nature an order of efficient or agent causes, nor can we ever meet a being which is its own maker or efficient cause. Nothing, it is self-evident, can make itself. We could perhaps prove this by stating that an efficient cause is necessarily anterior to that which it makes or causes, and since no being can exist before itself, then no being can be its own efficient cause. Now, this order of efficient cause may be considered temporally, that is, in time and in the order of generation, in which case, there could possibly be an infinite regress, at least a potentially infinite regress, given the time. But this is by no means the case in the order of creation, of reality, in the hierarchical order where the efficient cause is anterior to its effect in a relation that makes it to be not just anterior but primary in the sense of superior. It is superior to its effect in an order of relation that we will find to be, in the case of the First Efficient Cause, the relation of creation, a strictly one-way relation which exists only in the effect, and not in the cause.

So, if we trace the order of efficient causes up through the hierarchy of being, we must of necessity arrive at the source of all efficiency, which is God. The relation of all other efficiency to Him, therefore, is that of the relation of creation, one of absolute dependence. Without God's efficient causality, there could not possibly be any efficient causality (as of secondary causes) in the world. And so, nothing would exist except God. This argument is irrefutable.

It has been suggested by scholars that there are not, in Saint Thomas, five ways of proving God's existence, but really only one proof with five parts or aspects. We will see this similarity in the third way, too. But while each proof is sufficient unto itself and irrefutable, containing at least virtually all the others, still it must be said that each one casts a slightly different light on God's Existence as Actuality. The structure of each proof is, indeed, the same, and any one of the five ways is enough to establish the existence of God. But each proof begins from a different series of God's effects and brings out a different aspect of the divine actuality and causality.

The third way is from possibility and necessity. At first sight this may seem to be but different words for the same ideas used in the first way-- potency and act. But not so. Here are really different aspects of God's causality, at least as seen from our limited and piece-meal point of view.

It is possible for any being that now exists not to have made it into existence, and we observe that all things that do come into existence, are but a few of those that might have come into existence. Also, those that do come into existence, begin to corrupt and eventually pass away. Now, it is impossible for such utterly and radically contingent beings to have always existed. And they certainly could not exist at all by themselves. For that which is possible could at some time not have been and at some time most certainly was not. And so,

reason tells us that if everything that exists at some time, at some other time was not, then at one time, and even now, there would be nothing. This is the crux of the proof. Let us be sure to grasp it. For, if there were not a Being Whose existence was necessary and containing no possibility of coming into being or of passing away, the nothing at all could be in existence at the present time. This is true whether the order be one of generation and temporal, or hierarchical and a-temporal.

And so, we see clearly that there would be nothing at all now or ever if there were not God, because that which comes into existence contingently does so only by means of some agent already in act. But if this agent is itself a being contingent upon some other being for its existence, then there must be in existence some Being that is absolutely necessary in Himself, containing no possibility of coming to be and passing away. And this Being we call God. And we see that His existence is absolutely necessary if anything at all is to exist.

This proof also emphasizes the radical contingency of creatures, that is, their absolute dependence upon God for their very existence. Saint Thomas calls this dependence the relation of creation, and it is a relation that is in the creature only, for God depends upon nothing. He has in Himself absolutely no contingency. Contingency, however, or radical and absolute dependence, is an essential note of the creature. It is, in a word, exactly what it means to be a creature: to depend upon God for one's very existence—and not just at the time of coming into being but at every moment of time one exists. And, also, of course, in eternity too.

The fourth way is taken from the gradation or degrees of being in things. This proof may seem to have more in common with the Platonic-Augustinian ways of arriving at God's existence because of its appeal to abstract concepts such as goodness, truth, and nobility. But a closer look shows us that Saint Thomas is not appealing directly to these ideas or to their existence in things but rather to the fact that they are graduated, that is, that we observe them to occur in degrees. In each genus of things, for example, there is a *maximum ens*, a highest form of that genus of quality, as fire is the hottest of all hot things. But our reason requires a Being that is supreme in every category and embraces the maximum of every perfection. Otherwise, how explain the presence of the maximum in each genus, for it cannot be its own explanation? So there is required an infinite cause of all the perfections existing in finite and imperfect ways in creatures. For the finite and the imperfect will never be able to give rise to the infinite and perfect. More cannot arise from less and the imperfect does not come of itself to perfection. The Being our reason requires is God.

Here we may say that the total hierarchical structure of reality itself manifests, even cries out and declares the existence of the Source of its manifold but always limited and imperfect degrees of being. And this is God.

The fifth way is taken from the governance of the world. We must interpret the word governance in its most active, dynamic sense, for

this proof--famous as the proof from design or teleology--really points to the existence of a God far greater in magnificence and power than Paley's Watchmaker, the Masonic Architect, or the Newtonian Author of Nature.

Saint Thomas says that we see things which lack intelligence, such as natural bodies, acting for an end so that they always or nearly always obtain the best result. Thomas gives us no examples here, but he is clearly thinking not only of the movements of the sun, moon, and stars in their regular courses, but also of the instinctive, quasi-intelligent activities of animals. It is plain, he says, that these actions do not proceed by chance but assuredly by design. But whose design? What lacks intelligence, or the power to plan intelligent activity, cannot move towards an end unless it be directed by some being with intelligence. So the arrow is shot to its mark by the archer.

In this emphasis upon the final cause or teleological and therefore intelligible activity of all things, Thomas is proving that the very reason for which the efficient cause of the second way moves or causes all things to act and endows them with secondary causality according to their specific nature--this reason is beyond the immediate activity. In the words of Etienne Gilson (p.75), this fifth way "arrives ... not only nor first of all at the reason for what order there is in the universe, but also and pre-eminently at the reason for nature itself. In brief, beyond the intelligible manner of existing, the final cause attains the supreme reason for which beings exist."

Not only does God exist, but He is the destiny, the end of everything that He has caused to be, the reason for all existence. He is that for which and by which all things act, even when they are not so aware. Here, as perhaps nowhere else in the natural order of things, based on reason alone, we arrive at that predicate nominative supplied by Saint John the Evangelist when he tells us that "God is Love" (1 John 4:8). It is certainly why, as Saint Augustine exclaims so poignantly in his *Confessions*, "Thou hast made us for Thyself, O God, and our hearts are ever restless until they rest in Thee." For all creation does God's will, ordered by Him to Himself, but only man, being free, can resist the attraction of God as his destiny and end, the object of compelling love.

We may sum up the five ways of proving God's existence in this way: God is infinite dynamism in Himself though without change or motion; He is infinite efficiency and power being the First Cause of all other causality; He is absolute necessity without Whom nothing would or could exist; He is infinite perfection; and He is infinite Wisdom and Love, being the final end and destiny of all things--a fitting gloss upon the "invisible power and divinity" of Saint Paul in Romans 1:20.

3. CREATION

Saint Thomas differed yet again from the other great theologians of his time, notably Saint Bonaventure, in holding that creation of the universe from nothing (*ex nihilo*) is a truth of divine Faith and cannot be arrived at by unaided natural reason. Perhaps it is because Saint Thomas saw Aristotle as the embodiment of the highest that natural

reason could attain without the gift of Divine Revelation that he held this. Aristotle believed in the eternity of the world, or, at least, he did not see how it could be otherwise, and indeed, his logic is irrefutable. Saint Thomas appreciated this fact.

The efficient cause of the five ways of Saint Thomas is not, therefore, the God of Genesis Who creates all things at the beginning of time from nothing by His Word alone. This God must be revealed to men by Himself in order for man to know it. This is the view of Saint Thomas. The most that natural reason can attain is the necessity for a first uncaused cause of all things. The reason for the mind's ability to reach this far is that the notion of causality is a first principle immediately known by the natural light of reason as soon as it awakens in contact with experience. And Saint Thomas saw this power of natural reason best exemplified in Aristotle. But the inadequacy of this same natural reason to proceed further is demonstrated by the propensity of the pagan philosophers to fall into such errors as the eternity of the world and of matter, not to mention the worse errors exhibited by those other than Aristotle. It must be said that he is the best--and invaluable for us in so many areas. His metaphysics of substance is far superior to Plato's metaphysics of ideas and to the crude materialism of the pre-Socratics.

Therefore, Saint Thomas rightly concludes that in order to possess the true idea of God as Creator, we need Divine Revelation and the light of divine Faith.

At this precise juncture, at this dividing line between reason and Faith, there comes the necessity for good will on the part of man (Luke 2:14), that is, a submission or docility of mind and a willingness to receive and to accept God's gift of the revelation of Himself. We witness the immense benefits that flow from this loving submission of reason to Faith in the work of the Creationists today and in the flowering of theology during the Middle Ages. Contrariwise, we also see only too clearly today that the most pernicious and degrading errors dominate men as they refuse to submit their reason to God's Word.

Divine Faith is like the light of the sun that illumines all things, and when human reason, which in comparison is like a puny light bulb, loses its light in the divine radiance of Faith, then truth reigns, for "in Thy Light we see light" (Psalm 36:9).

Allow me to conclude with a quotation from Etienne Gilson (pp.57-58):

Man has, then, no other recourse here below than to return to God by way of thought, beginning with the sensible knowledge coming from His effects. In doing this, we do no more than give philosophical meaning to the words of the Apostle: The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen (Romans 1:20). Certainly all theologians and Christian philosophers who have spoken about the existence of God have quoted these words, but St. Thomas took them in all their living force. For him they signify that man can start from God's effects and come to know His existence; and that man can only know

God's existence by starting from His effects. From this point on, it becomes a matter of proceeding from the existences given in experience to the inferred existence of their cause. In thus revealing in its purity the profound meaning of the rather simple question: Is there a God? St. Thomas gives its full meaning to the very problem he was about to resolve. It was he who made it what we shall henceforth rightly call it, the problem of the existence of God.

REFERENCES

- Saint Thomas Aquinas. *Summa Theologica* 3 vols. Literally trans. by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province. New York: Benziger Brothers, Inc., 1947.
- Gilson, Etienne. *The Christian Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas*. New York: Random House, 1956.

POETRY

THE VOICE OF LITTLE THINGS

I do not need an Alpine crest
Or awesome redwoods reigning high
To know that God is manifest,
I see him in a butterfly.
I sense God's touch in starlight gleaming,
And in the crocus' springtime dreaming.
With tiny key
He opens doors to majesty.

I do not need to be aware
of solar force and boundless space
To thrill to sunbeams in the air,
Each shaft a handiwork of grace.
Wondrous are the bluebells ringing,
And baby hummingbirds a - winging;
They let me know
A higher power has made them so.

Each dewdrop is a diadem,
A miracle, each emerald grass,
Each violet a sapphire gem,
Each breeze a perfume as I pass.

I need no thunder, driving, pounding,
Or roar of ocean waves, resounding
His worth to tell, -
God's little wonders speak so well.

Viola Jacobson Berg

MAN AND HIS ENVIRONMENT: THE CREATIONIST PERSPECTIVE

Ralph E. Ancil

The creationist recognizes that man was originally created perfect and placed in a perfect, friendly environment designed to be his home. He does not see agriculture as destructive of nature but remembers that God intended the earth to be cultivated (Gen. 2:5, 15). In this perspective, everything in creation is recognized as having its own rightful place. God pronounced that all His creation was exceedingly good (Gen. 1:31). Therefore, respect for the Creator requires respect for His creation. It is thus with a sense of respect, humility, gratitude and obligation that the creationist assumes his role as steward of his Master's estate and cares for God's handiwork, not to please himself with personal comfort, but to please his Creator and to have fellowship with Him.

By accepting the Genesis account for the simple historical truth it is, the creationist acknowledges man's unique position as a steward: he rules creation and yet is himself created. The evolutionist also recognizes this unique position but cannot fully understand it. As Rene Dubos so aptly observed:

We must learn to live with a paradox inherent in the human condition. On the one hand man is still of nature, but he has lived outside nature in artificial environments since the agricultural revolution. Human ways of life must of course be compatible with natural laws, but they cannot be the ways of nature.¹

In other words, from the evolutionist's view man is a product of nature, but unlike any other "animal" he has evolved to a point where he stands outside of, and in opposition to, the very nature which supposedly produced him.

The evolutionist faces this contradiction because he defines nature (including man) in terms of itself. This seems analogous to a violation of Goedel's Theorem.² Man and nature can only be fully understood in terms which are not natural or which are supernatural. In other words, man and nature cannot ultimately be understood apart from God. The creationist perspective, unlike the evolutionist, is fully rational. This allows man to understand himself and nature and explains his unique position in it: he is natural (or physical) like all other creatures, but he is also trans-natural (or spiritual) in that he is created in the image of God and so has the power to comprehend and rule over nature. The closer that image is to God, the better his understanding and rule of nature will be. The more intimate his fellowship with his Maker the better he can care for what is made. Thus, man's dominion is reflected in his relationship with God. It is an avenue, a primary activity, whereby he can become more like his

Maker for it requires him to exercise his highest faculties. It is then God's dominion over man which necessarily defines, delimits and rationalizes man's dominion over nature. Thus, the physical and the spiritual, the body and the soul are harmonized into one. Instead of an inexplicable "paradox" the creationist recognizes a marvelous duality.

C. S. Lewis likewise seems to have recognized this principle, for he writes:

As long as one is a Naturalist, "Nature" is only a word for "everything." And everything is not a subject about which anything very interesting can be said or (save by illusion) - felt. ... And then, because we falsely take her for the ultimate and self-existent Fact and cannot quite repress our high instinct to worship the Self-existent, we are all at sea and our moods fluctuate and Nature means to us whatever we please as the moods select and slur. But everything becomes different when we recognize that Nature is a creature, a created thing, with its own particular tang or flavour. ... It is not in her, but in Something far beyond her, that all lines meet and all contrasts are explained.

Lewis later adds:

The Englishness of English is audible only to those who know some other language as well. In the same way and for the same reason, only Supernaturalists really see Nature. You must go a little away from her, and then turn around, and look back. Then at last the true landscape will become visible. You must have tasted, however briefly, the pure water from beyond the world before you can be distinctly conscious of the hot, salty tang of Nature's current. To treat her as God, or as Everything, is to lose the whole pith and pleasure of her. Come out, look back, and then you will see ...³

Of course, the original Edenic perfection no longer exists. Nature can be harsh; life is not always pleasant. The creationist understands that the single biggest reason for environmental degradation is man's sin. The willful disobedience of man spoiled the original perfect harmony. Because man's relationship to God was thus tainted, his ability to rule the earth wisely was also spoiled. In order to become reconciled to creation, man must become reconciled to God. This reconciliation occurs through the medium of Jesus Christ. The harshness of nature is, therefore, not a justification for ruthless reciprocity but a reminder of sin and a call to repentance.

As an alternative to conventional evolutionism, the creation concept has two features, closure and theism. By closure is meant the idea that God created a complete, perfect and purposeful universe, with a definite beginning and end; it has temporal-spatial boundaries. By theism is meant the belief that God, though external to His creation, is nevertheless everywhere immanent or transcendent, lovingly sustaining and operating the world.

These two features are noticeable also in the moral sphere. The creationist believes that God has given man a set of moral values

which are final and complete and serve as an external standard of human conduct, thus providing moral boundaries. Furthermore, God's loving care and sustenance are necessary for the continuous moral and spiritual life of man. By contrast the non-theistic evolutionist holds moral issues to be without closure or bounds but open-ended and subject to continuous change. Man must sustain himself; he must save himself.

Creationist scientists have demonstrated environmental awareness. For instance, one of the founders of the conservation movement was a creation scientist. While Charles Darwin and others were searching for materialistic explanations of life in the 1850's, America's best known scientist, Louis Agassiz, was lecturing at Harvard University on the need for conservation of our land resources.⁴ How long was this form of environmental concern, initiated by a creation scientist, delayed because of a preoccupation with evolution and materialism?

Certainly Christians have not always lived up to biblical standards, and to the extent they have not, they have contributed to environmental problems. This is especially true of liberal churches which have led the way in compromising Scripture with evolutionism and other secular ideas. But the biblical basis for environmental concern is there. By recognizing the historicity of the Genesis account, the Bible-believing Christian has a firm foundation for articulating a sound philosophy of ecology. It is a philosophy which does not suffer from the extremism of "doom and gloom" projections which demand radical social change, nor from "hysterical optimism" in technology as man's omnipotent savior.

The creationist realizes that there are severe environmental problems which require his attention. He knows man's primary purpose is not the pursuit of material comfort or the service of nature; rather, it is to be obedient to his Creator and Redeemer in all things. He recognizes that true prosperity is a gift of God, not ultimately of market mechanisms or government control, and that when individuals or nations serve Him He blesses them richly. The creationist welcomes technological and industrial development, but not at the expense of God's creation, for stewardship is part of man's duty to his Maker. It is a philosophy which allows him to prioritize and ameliorate many environmental problems while preserving biblical Christian values.

Instead of pointless, endless social evolution the creationist sees purpose, completeness and constancy in both the moral and physical worlds. Salvation comes neither from man nor nature but from the Creator and Redeemer of both. Indeed, the conservation of biblical principles and values is indispensable to the conservation of creation.

NOTES

1. Quoted in G. Tyler Miller, Jr., *Living in the Environment: Concepts, Problems, and Alternatives* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1975), p. 40.

2. In 1931 Kurt Goedel gave a mathematical proof that a system of axioms can never be based on itself, in order to prove the system's validity, statements from outside that system must be used. This concept has been applied to science, i.e., science is possible only within a larger context of non-science issues and concerns. See Victor F. Weisskopf, "Frontiers and Limits of Science," *American Scientist* 65(4): 405-411, July-August, 1977. See also Ernest Nagel and James R. Newman, *Goedel's Proof* (New York University Press, 1958). From the foregoing definition, a violation of Goedel's Theorem would involve an attempt to prove or define a system in its own terms, i.e., using statements from *inside* the system.
3. C. S. Lewis, *Miracles: A Preliminary Study* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., 1947), pp. 65-67.
4. J. Edwin Becht and L. Belzung, *World Resource Management: Key to Civilization and Social Achievement* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975), p. 35.



ABORTION AND ANIMAL RIGHTS: TWO SIDES OF ONE COIN

Maria L. Boccia

The two topics, abortion and animal rights, seem to be worlds apart, and it is surprising to many that those who are vigorous advocates of animal rights are also vigorous advocates of human abortion. But I believe there is a common source of both these positions. Both are grounded in a non-Christian, evolutionary worldview.

The rise of evolutionary theory in the mid-nineteenth century has had a wide-ranging impact on most areas of human thought, life, and culture. A naturalistic, materialistic worldview has replaced the Christian, creation-based worldview.

Within the Christian worldview, human beings hold a unique place in the creation: We are created spiritual beings, made in the image of God (Gen. 1:26), and uniquely the object of God's salvific attention (Ps. 8:3-5). We were given the mandate to be His vice-regents in the earth, to be stewards over it and to have dominion and subdue it (Gen. 1:28). This mandate has not been revoked, although it has been distorted by the Fall and is being redeemed in the Christian church, a process which will not be completed until the renewal of all things at the end. Two of the results of this world view are first, the sanctity of human life and the recognition of a fundamental distinction between animal and human life, and second, the importance of the careful and respectful treatment of all members of God's creation.

First, that human beings are uniquely made in the image of God and have a soul whose eternal destiny is in the hands of a sovereign God should give everyone pause in considering how they treat their fellow human beings. The decisions we make and the way we treat each other should be grounded in the recognition that the other person is made in God's image. Abortion is abhorrent because it destroys a person made in God's image. Many other issues in the treatment of others should also be grounded in this knowledge, including physical and sexual abuse of children, wife-battering, drunkenness and drug abuse, etc.

Second, the cultural mandate to have dominion over and subdue the earth is not a blanket permission to exploit the earth to our own profit without any consideration to our impact on the earth. We are merely stewards of God's earth; He is the owner. As such, we will have to account for our use of His resources when we stand before the Judgment Seat, knowing that those who destroy the earth will be destroyed by God (Rev. 11:15-18). Knowing this, we should consider carefully every choice we make in the way we use the resources He has lent us. Furthermore, with the Fall, our ability to fulfill this mandate has been seriously distorted and disrupted, but not revoked. When our first parents fell, they placed themselves under the dominion of Satan,

and the result has been the permeation of sin into all areas of human endeavor, including cultural. We can see some of the effects of this in the rapid growth in the rate of extinction of species due to human intervention and habitat destruction, as well as the incredible amounts of pollution we have created. Christians, however, as the redeemed of the Lord, should be in the forefront of the fight to undo these effects of the Fall, and bring the effects of our redemption to the rest of creation (Rom. 8:19-21).

Our responsibility to God for our stewardship of the creation is not the only reason for carefully considering how we treat it. The whole of creation reflects the eternal attributes of God (Romans 1:20). As such, it has intrinsic worth and dignity, which we, as the children of God, must respect and cultivate. Thus, when we use animals, and other resources which God has provided, in our efforts to relieve human suffering in disease, or whatever, we have a responsibility to treat those animals humanely and respectfully, and minimize their pain and discomfort. We must recognize, however, that because human beings are made in the image of God, and are the objects of His plan of salvation, the relief of human suffering must come before the needs of animals.

The evolutionary worldview presents a completely different view of the world. There is no supreme Creator to whom we will be held accountable for our actions in the creation. The single principle which justifies all actions is survival. All species' worth is measured by their success in adapting to and surviving in whatever environment they find themselves. It is the ultimate in self-centered, selfish systems.

There is, furthermore, no value distinction between humans and animals: human beings are just one species of primate, which has had an unusual degree of intellectual development and biological success. The evolutionary worldview gives no basis for preferring one species over another, even one's own; the bottom line is biological survival; reproductive success.

There are two possible consequences of this worldview. First, one may lower human beings to the level of animals: human beings are nothing but naked apes. Hence, abortion is just the ridding oneself of an undesired bit of primate flesh. Second, one may raise animals to the level of human beings. All species have evolved equal, and all have the same right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Hence, the extremism of the animal rights movement, and the development of the derogatory expression "speciesism" to indicate giving precedence to humans over other species.

The Christian response to both these movements must begin with an understanding that the fundamental problem is a distorted view of human nature. We must address the non-Christian worldview which has given birth to both these distortions, and uncover and proclaim the error of this view. We must rephrase and reframe the Christian worldview and present it to the unbelieving world so that it can be understood to be the Truth which it is. Until and unless a person recognizes the unique position of human beings, created in the image of God, and vice-regents appointed by God to have dominion over the

earth, even in our fallen state, real progress in both these areas will be extremely limited.

TALK TO THE ANIMALS

R. E. McMaster, Jr.

Ultimately, there are only two religions on earth: the religion of the true God and a religion based on man. Each of these has a doctrine of origins and world order. In the first religion, the order is a created and stewarded one; in the second, it is one of chance and evolution.

Under the religion of man, we have all "evolved" from the slime. So we are all equal: we are all "animals." Mankind is no better (nor worth any more) than any other animal. "All animals are created equal." If we are opposed to the death penalty for mankind, it only stands to evolutionary reason that we should also be opposed to the death penalty for animals.

It was thus inevitable in our present religious climate that the animal rights activists would surface.

Now don't get me wrong. I love animals. My family raises llamas, fallow deer, horses, goats, chickens, cats and dogs. We love them, groom them, show them and win prizes at the county fair with them. We only harvest what we eat. But I do not believe that I am an animal. I believe, instead, that man has a unique relationship to animals in the divinely created order, namely that man has a God-given position of husbandry when it comes to the animal kingdom.

The evolutionary animal rights groups vehemently disagree with this idea. In fact, they have taken their own position to the opposite extreme. Animals, in their view, are more important than people, and it is their demand that people and their civilization retreat from their intrusions into "nature."

It is the essence of civilization, of course, to be in "conflict" with "nature." Cities, highways, homes, businesses, military installations, factories, parks--all displace the untamed environment, including the habitat of wild animals. Agriculture, as the word itself discloses, is a form of "culture" and is also in competition with wildlife. Cattle and sheep graze on land competitively with deer, rabbits and other wildlife.

But civilization and husbandry involve the management of nature's conflicts. Well-managed hunting, for example, helps maintain the delicate balance between the needs of domesticated and untamed animals. Wildlife biologists encourage hunting to maintain the right number of head of wildlife per acre and thereby prevent disease epidemics related to overpopulations from sweeping the wildlife kingdom. A wildlife activist should really go after the poachers who take more fish, birds and animals illegally each year than are legally taken.

Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr., writing for the Ludwig von Mises Institute, penned a timely article entitled "Animal Crackers" in which he reports

that People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) recently purchased six lobsters from a Chinese restaurant in Maryland to prevent them from being "murdered, dismembered, and eaten." These "liberated lobsters" were then flown to the Maine coast (an expense coming out of PETA's \$5 million annual budget) and there released into the Atlantic. Rockwell quotes Ingrid Newkirk, director of PETA, as saying, "A rat is a pig is a dog is a boy." Alex Pacheco, PETA's chairman, declared, "We feel that animals have the same rights as a retarded human child." These statements are consistent evolutionary remarks, crazy as they may be.

But not as crazy, perhaps, as the actions of radical animal rights advocates. Rockwell reports that one was arrested while trying to murder the president of a medical research company with a remote-control bomb. Additionally, radical activists have set fires to research labs; fried-chicken restaurants have been torched; fur stores have been burned down, women wearing furs have been subjected to spray-paint attacks; turkey farms have been burglarized; medical records have been stolen; zoo employees have been assaulted, and butcher shops vandalized. Arson, property destruction, attempted murder, burglary and theft are considered "acceptable crimes" by these animal rights activists. In other words, in a manner consistent with evolutionary faith, man is his own god and makes his own moral and civil laws.

Rockwell wonders why these activists don't stand between a Kodiak bear and a spawning salmon, or between a lion and an antelope. Next Thanksgiving and Christmas, the petition will be for Americans to eat tofu instead of turkey. This past Christmas, PETA urged Americans to sing Christmas carols to zoo animals "to draw attention to their imprisonment."

The Humane Society now says that bacon and eggs are the "Breakfast of Cruelty." PETA calls McDonald's "McDeath" for serving cheeseburgers. Beef may not be eaten, nor may cows be killed for their leather, or even exploited for milk and cheese. The eating of fish, chicken or even snails is to be banned. The sale of goosedown pillows, wool suits and silk blouses is to be outlawed. Geese are not to be plucked; sheep are not to be sheared; silkworms are not to be harvested. Cockroaches, too, "have a right to live" because they are "efficient little garbage collectors." A Canadian activist told *The Toronto Globe and Mail* that "viruses such as smallpox should be reinstated as part of the earth's natural ecosystem."

"Innocent rabbits" should no longer be used for medical testing in labs. Nor should rats be available for that use. Minks, foxes and other fur-bearing creatures are raised in "animal Auschwitzes." These fur-bearers are "maltreated while alive, killed cruelly, and worn in savagery." Wearing animal fur is said to be "no different from the Buchenwald commandant who made a lampshade out of human skin."

Given the above, it was no surprise that in early January (1990), the

Humane Society expressed outrage over an artist's plan to snuff out his pet rat "Snuffy" by flattening him with a 55-pound concrete block. Artist Rick Gibson of Vancouver, British Columbia, declared that two canvasses would be created in smashing the rat. One would be under the rodent, and one above on the 55-pound block that Gibson planned to drop on his rat. "I'm giving a public demonstration, a free art lesson, to show people how they could do this themselves," declared Gibson.

Gibson insisted that his method of killing Snuffy would be humane and legal and that Snuffy would be well cared for right up until his end. "I have no desire to mistreat him at all." Needless to say, the Vancouver Humane Society was incensed at all this "artistry." But under evolution, there are no standards, no fixed laws. So how could they complain? On what grounds?

Gibson built a guillotine-like apparatus on which the 55-pound concrete block would slide down on a pole to smash the rat. This cruel act (in my opinion) was scheduled to occur in front of the Vancouver Library on January 6th. Gibson additionally justified his action by declaring that killing a rat for art was no worse than trapping or poisoning it as a pest, or using it for medical experiments. He said that he bought Snuffy from a pet shop, and that the rat would otherwise have ended up as a meal for a snake or a lizard.

As it turns out, Gibson was forced to call off his rat-squashing event because someone stole his concrete block. Gibson told a Vancouver crowd of about 300 people, who later angrily chased him from the scene, that he believed an animal rights activist had stolen his art creation. Gloomily, Gibson turned Snuffy the Rat back to the pet store. He called off his art project forever.

All this goes to show that when mankind drifts from the plumbline of God's Law-Word, inevitably he ends up a blockhead, smashed by madness.

(Reprinted from *Chalcedon*, Box 158, Vallecito, CA 95251, No.297, April 1990.)

TRAINING PARK INTERPRETERS: SOME GUESTS ARE LESS WELCOME THAN OTHERS

In a sad commentary on intolerance in our society, parks personnel in Canada and the United States have identified some citizens from these two countries as unwelcome influences. An article with suggestions on how to handle these unwelcome "guests" was printed in the Newsletter of interpretation Canada (Alberta Section): vol.10, no.3, November 1989, p.7. It was based on a United States National Parks training paper. The message of the article was that parks' interpreters must never lose the upper hand in dealing with creationists.

A naturalist, when faced with someone who objects to his/her remarks about dinosaurs, or the age of rocks, is advised not to say that everyone is entitled to their own opinions. No, No! That is too conciliatory. The interpreter is rather to "evaluate" the creationist. Is the person a "gentle, soft-spoken" type who is easily cowed? The article recommends that the interpreter allow this person to speak at the end of the proceedings, when most of the crowd will have dispersed and will not hear him/her. The important thing, says the article, is that the interpreter has not backed down or "equivocated one inch." Appearances of credibility are so important.

If, alternatively, the creationist is an "aggressive shouting bully who is looking for a fight," then the interpreter is to be more aggressive too. The "bully" is to be told firmly that he must be quiet. If that does not work, the creationist is to be pushed into agreeing to some compromising definitions. Try to get him to define religion in general - the article advises: "With a bit of prompting, you can get something like 'a person's concept of the Order of the Universe and his place within it, based on the written or spoken word of other people.'" Then prompt the audience to define science, the article recommends, in terms like: "Science is a concept of the Order of the Universe, and one's place within it, based on observation, experiment, and closely controlled logic." Faced with these definitions it is hoped that the "bully" will be robbed of any desire for further confrontation, presumably because he has been outmaneuvered. . . .

If the creationist persists in his remarks, the interpreter is advised to call the police to "protect the group." Another possibility is to go later with the individual to a quiet place, where no one else can hear. There the interpreter can listen to the creationist's remarks. First, last, and always the interpreter is to maintain control of the situation. Psychology is such an important aspect in the manipulating of public opinion.

It goes without saying that park interpreters are there to serve all taxpayers and all those who have paid admission to these facilities.

If the interpreters solicit questions (they almost always do), then they are bound to treat each query in an equally polite manner. If the concerned citizens confine themselves to questions dealing with science, then the interpreters will have no excuse whatsoever for a hostile reaction. Questions like: "Could you review the assumptions which scientists must make in order to come to a conclusion such as you have just mentioned ... ?" or "How do you explain ... in view of the work of ..., who found out?" How will the interpreters identify unwelcome guests then, and how will they deal with situations in which they lack convincing answers? Will they call the police?

Editor's Note: Reprinted from *Creation Science Dialogue*, Vol.17, No.1 ("Spring Dialogue," March 1990), p.3, published by Creation Science Association of Alberta, Box 9075, Station E, Edmonton, Alberta T5P 4K1, Canada.

TRUTH AND THE CHRISTIAN TEACHER

Edward Coleson

"And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:38), as our Lord promised. Our Bibles abound with references to the truth and with assurances that we can know it, but truth was an early casualty in the war against God and His Word - or so the enemy thought. In a devastating essay, "The Polson of Subjectivism," C. S. Lewis¹ told us years ago that there were scientists "... who have dropped the words truth and reality out of their vocabularies. ..." As pragmatists they were content to get results; if a thing works, at least in the short run, that is good enough for them. The very same thinking was also carried over into ethics. According to the modern viewpoint, our moral standards are simply mores, quaint customs of long ago without the authority of the "Thus saith the Lord!" Quoting Lewis further, "Out of this apparently innocent idea comes the disease that will certainly end our species (and, in my view, damn our souls) if it is not crushed...." The ethical anarchy of our age is the consequence of the wholesale rejection of truth by modern man. The AIDS epidemic is just one more proof that the "wages of sin is death" (Rom. 6:23)

While it is certainly true that more and more people are increasingly concerned over the moral bankruptcy of America and our world, it seems that few are aware that our indifference to the eternal verities has produced another serious problem: our educational crisis. The root of the difficulty is that without a Christian philosophy of education our curriculum soon becomes "without form and void" and it takes the Creator's touch to bring order out of chaos once more. Back in the early decades of the last century, the pre-Darwinian era, it was commonly believed that God in His wisdom had arranged His creation in such a fashion that, while the cosmos was clearly beyond human comprehension, it was possible for us mere mortals to know the basic principles thereof: God's laws. These fundamental understandings formed a harmonious "code" that was within human comprehension; they were to be found in our Bibles and that great "book of nature," God's creation. Devout scientists then believed as they were pursuing their research that "they were thinking God's thoughts after Him." The task of the scholar was to discover the Lord's truth and make it available to the general public. The responsibilities of the teacher were clearly defined also: know the truth within one's capabilities and pass it on to the next generation.

To understand the "world view" of the pre-Darwinian era one must go back to the Puritan period two centuries earlier. They believed that God had made a "Covenant" (a contract or legal agreement) with them as He did with the ancient Hebrews; if they obeyed Him, He

would bless and prosper them. Disobedience, of course, brought judgment. Their concerns were more than spiritual; they believed the "Judge of all the earth" (Gen: 18:25) was sovereign over all, the practical affairs of life too. The great scientist of this era was Sir Isaac Newton (1642-1727), a devout Christian who was as much interested in theology as in physics and astronomy. We make much over the fact that the heresy of their religious thinking tended to deism, but let's not throw out their orthodoxy because it could be perverted. Perhaps a couple of illustrations will help us understand how their Christian perspective came to dominate areas of learning which even most Christians would now consider "secular." In 1765 Sir William Blackstone began the publication of his famous *Commentaries on the Law of England*, a scholarly work that would have a great influence for many decades on this side of the Atlantic too. In the introduction he told us what should be the foundation of the legal system:

This law of nature, ... dictated by God Himself, is, of course, superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe in all countries and at all times: no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this. ...

This, of course, was no new idea; it is a basic doctrine of both the Hebrew and the Christian faith, but was shared by enlightened Greeks and Romans before Christ was born. Our contemporary legal crisis is the consequence of the rejection of this important truth.

With the recognition that the Creator had provided the proper basis for the legal system and with a great revival in progress in England, reforms which had always seemed impossible now were being accomplished. In 1772 the slaves were freed in England by a decision of the King's Bench (their supreme court); slavery was contrary to God's law. There weren't very many there perhaps ten or fifteen thousand, but it was a beginning. An abolition movement came into being with William Wilberforce, a member of Parliament as their spokesman. In 1807, during the worst of the Napoleonic Wars, the slave trade was abolished; they believed they could not ask the Lord for His help while their ships were carrying slaves to the Americas. In 1833 Parliament passed the Emancipation Law, freeing the slaves in the British colonies, their islands in the West Indies, etc.. Wilberforce lay dying as the bill was making its way through Parliament, but he lived long enough to know it would pass. He died happy, knowing the world was getting better and he had done his part to make it happen. Will you and I have that comfort in our final hours?

Their concern with making their legal code conform to the moral law took them into an area which would seem strange to us. Thoughtful people had long noticed that laws were pushed through Parliament to promote the selfish interests of powerful pressure groups at the expense of everyone else; obviously the law should provide justice for all, not favors for some. Adam Smith attempted to deal with this problem in his pioneer economics book, published in 1776. He said that if people obeyed the moral law in their business transactions, they should be free to conduct their affairs as they saw fit. To take one example, a farmer should be free to raise any amount of any

legitimate crop on his own land and dispose of his produce in any honest way; any attempt to abridge his freedom to do so is tyranny. He believed, as did Saint Paul, that all things could work together for good (Rom. 8:28), if we obeyed God's law. The widespread notion that Smith condoned greed is ridiculous; those who say that never read *The Wealth of Nations*. In fact, he is especially eloquent in denouncing the greedy in politics, business, the trades and everywhere else. The British belatedly adopted Smith's "obvious and simple system of natural liberty," but it was not until 1846 and in a time of great crisis that they did so. As with the abolition of slavery, devout Christians were the leaders in achieving this reform. This "Christian economics" became the basis of British prosperity and power in the latter part of the last century. In 1882 the English magazine, *The Spectator*, could say:

Britain as a whole was never more tranquil and happy. No class is at war with society or the government: there is no disaffection anywhere, the treasury is fairly full, the accumulations of capital are vast.

To get the contrast, suppose we substitute today and the U.S.A. in the above quotation. We seem to enjoy pointing out that the Soviet system just isn't working, but ours isn't working very well either. In the last few years we have managed to make ourselves the biggest debtors in the world. There is a significant difference between the "Christian economics" of the English reformers of the 1840s and the American capitalism of the 1980s. They asked if a given policy or practice is right and we check to see if it is extremely profitable and don't worry about the ethics.

If the economic accomplishments of the Victorian era were not enough to establish their place in history, Karl Polanyi² has pointed out in his book, *The Great Transformation*, that "The nineteenth century produced a phenomenon unheard of in the annals of Western civilization, namely, a hundred years' peace." - Waterloo to World War I (Polanyi is speaking of Europe and is aware there were minor wars there in those years). We should remember also that Jacques Barzun³ correctly diagnosed the ailment that was to make our age what Sir Winston Churchill called "this terrible century," the triumph of Darwinism since 1859. But in the midst of our despair we should never forget that Christian principles have worked when they have been tried and they would work again. It is our task to proclaim the truth, the truth that "makes us free."

NOTES

1. C. S. Lewis, *Christian Reflections* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1967), pp. 72-73.
2. Karl Polanyi, *The Great Transformation* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1958), pp. 3-5.
3. Jacques Barzun, *Darwin, Marx, Wagner* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1958), pp. 92-93.

Clip and mail to: CREATION SOCIAL SCIENCE
AND HUMANITIES SOCIETY
1429 N. Holyoke
Wichita, Kansas 67208

☐ Enclosed is my payment of \$12* for Sustaining Membership dues. I subscribe to the Creation Social Science and Humanities Society's **Statement of Belief**:

1. The Bible is the written Word of God. It is inspired and inerrant throughout. Its assertions are historically and scientifically true in all the original autographs. To the student of the social sciences and humanities this means that the account of origins in Genesis is a factual presentation of simple historical truths.
2. All basic types of living things, including man, were made by direct creative acts of God during the Creation Week described in Genesis. Whatever biological changes have occurred since Creation Week have accomplished only changes within the original created kinds.
3. The great Flood described in Genesis, commonly referred to as the Noachian Flood, was an historic event worldwide in its extent and effect.
4. We are an organization of Christian men and women who accept Jesus Christ as our Lord and Saviour. The account of the special creation of Adam and Eve as one man and woman in the image of God and their subsequent fall into sin is the basis for our belief in the necessity of a Saviour for all mankind. Therefore, salvation can come only through accepting Jesus Christ as our Saviour.

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ ZIP: _____

*(\$13 U.S. if you reside outside the USA).

☐ Enclosed is non-member subscription fee of \$14 (foreign, \$15 U.S.) for one year's subscription to the **CSSH Quarterly**.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____ Zip _____

DEVOTIONAL: CREATION AND WORSHIP page 1
Ellen Myers

CREATION AND PROOF FOR THE
EXISTENCE OF GOD page 3
Ellen Myers

PROOFS FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD AND CREATION:
A CATHOLIC VIEW page 10
Paula Haigh

POETRY: THE VOICE OF LITTLE THINGS page 18
Viola Jacobson Berg

MAN AND HIS ENVIRONMENT:
THE CREATIONIST PERSPECTIVE page 19
Ralph E. Ancil

ABORTION AND ANIMAL RIGHTS:
TWO SIDES OF ONE COIN page 23
Marla L. Boccia

TALK TO THE ANIMALS page 25
R. E. McMaster, Jr.

TRAINING PARK INTERPRETERS:
SOME GUESTS ARE LESS WELCOME THAN OTHERS page 28

TRUTH AND THE CHRISTIAN TEACHER page 30
Edward Coleson

Creation Social Science
& Humanities Society
1429 N. Holyoke (316) 683-3610
Wichita, Kansas 67208

Non-Profit Org. U.S. Postage PAID Wichita, Kansas Permit No. 929
--

MO ASSN FOR CREATION
405 N SAPPINGTON RD
GLENDALE

MO

63122